

Application No. 09/870,300
Amendment "B" dated June 30, 2004
Reply to Office Action mailed May 5, 2004

REMARKS

Applicants express appreciation to the Examiner for the courtesy of the recent interview granted to Applicants' attorney. The claim amendments made by this paper are consistent with the proposed claim amendments and with other suggestions made by the Examiner during the course of the Interview held June 15, 2004.

The latest Office Action mailed May 5, 2004, considered claims 1-22, of which claims 9-22 were withdrawn in a previous response. In the last action, claims 4-8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement, while claims 1-3 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Boyce (U.S. Patent No. 5,614,952)¹.

By this paper, claims 1, 4 and 7 have been amended, with claim 1 being the only independent claim at issue.

As discussed during the interview, the system described in claim 1 is neither anticipated by nor made obvious in view of the art of record. In particular, Boyce fails to disclose a system having a decoder that includes a subsampling module for subsampling spatial domain data by a selected factor to generate subsampled spatial domain data, wherein subsampling the spatial domain data includes weighting color parameters of at least first and second spatial samples using at least first and second weighting factors, respectively, and summing the weighted color parameters of the at least first and second spatial samples to generate a color parameter of a subsample that corresponds to the at least first and second spatial samples, as claimed. In fact, Boyce fails to disclose any system in which weighting of color parameters occurs. Accordingly, for at least this reason, as well as the other reasons that were addressed during the interview, Applicant respectfully submits that the claimed system is distinguished and allowable over the art of record.

Applicant also submits that the amendments to claims 4 and 7 overcome the rejections to the drawings and the 35 U.S.C. § 112 rejections that were raised with regard to the term "second summer." Support for the dependent claims, including claims 4 and 7, which was specifically

¹ Although the prior art status of the cited art is not being challenged at this time, Applicants reserve the right to challenge the prior art status of the cited art at any appropriate time, should it arise. Accordingly, any arguments and amendments made herein should not be construed as acquiescing to any prior art status of the cited art.

Application No. 09/870,300
Amendment "B" dated June 30, 2004
Reply to Office Action mailed May 5, 2004

described and pointed out during the interview, includes, but is not limited to, the disclosure found in paragraphs [0039] and [0046].

Following these amendments and remarks, there are no rejections that remain of record. Accordingly, the present application should now be found in condition for prompt allowance.

In the event that the Examiner finds remaining impediment to a prompt allowance of this application that may be clarified through a telephone interview, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned attorney.

Dated this 30 day of June 2004.

Respectfully submitted,



RICK D. NYDEGGER
Registration No. 28,651
JENS C. JENKINS
Registration No. 44,803
Attorneys for Applicant

Customer No. 022913

RDN:JCJ:cm
W:\14531\89.1\CM0000003818V001.DOC